

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430) Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.opub.gov.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/691,644	10/24/2003	Min-Goo Kim	45945	7618		
Peter L. Kend	7590 09/30/200 all	EXAM	EXAMINER			
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W.			NGUYEN	NGUYEN, STEVE N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Washington, I		2117				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			09/30/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/691,644		KIM ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	STEVE NGUYEN	2117		

	STEVE NGUYEN	2117						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. So The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 TC R4 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire In Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period or extension and the corresponding amount of the fee appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a on NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•						
7. \(\) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-21.								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. \(\subseteq The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
/JACQUES H LOUIS-JACQUES/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2100								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that nowhere does Seidel et al. disclose anything about processing a result of the decoding of at least one of the received control message and data and controlling the physical layer according to a result of the processing.

In col. 7, lines 26-28, the result of decoding the sequence numbers in step 260 is processed and used to decode PDUs in step 270 in Fig. 5

The Applicant contends that the instant application is directed to processing a decoder result for controlling a physical layer later on, so it should be distinguished from the decoding operation of Seidel et al. The feature of transmitting ACK/NACK message in Seidel et al. is merely to inform a transmitter whether or not receiving a data, which is different from the claimed invention in controlling a physical layer.

The Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

The Applicant argues that nowhere does Fong et al. disclose anything about a HARQ controller performing an operation of a MAC layer, as recited in independent claim 1. because it fails to teach or suggest a MAC layer. Furthermore Applicant argues that HARQ and ARQ are different from each other. Therefore, it is unreasonable to assume that merely supporting ARQ in a communication system essentially means that the system also can support HARQ.

The Examiner asserts that Fong teaches a physical layer's HARQ controller that performs ARQ operations in col. 5, lines 9-18. HARQ is a type of ARQ and is a subset of ARQ; therefore all HARQ operations are ARQ operations.